DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1749/302725.01
Application No.: 10/646,941
Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.114

REMARKS

Claims 1-84 are pending in the application. claims 1, 51 and 68 are the independent claims. Claims 1-84 stand rejected. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 12, 16 – 18, 21, 25, 29, 33, 51, 53 – 59, 68, 70 – 76, and cancel claims 2, 19, 20, 52, 60, 61, 69, 77, and claim 78. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request review and examination of the pending claims.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

On October 9, 2007, the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner. Possible amendments to claim 1 were discussed during the interview and Applicants agreed to file a RCE.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In an office Action dated August 22, 2007 the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 18, 33 – 59, 62 – 76 and 79 – 84 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over D'Andrea and Janus (1996) ("D'Andrea"). With respect to claim 1, 51, and 68, and without conceding the proprietary of the rejection, Applicants herein amend claim 1, to include the limitations of claims 2, 19 and 20, claim 51 to include the limitations of claims 52, 60, and 61, and claim 68 to include the limitations of claim 69, 77, and 78. As a result of Applicants' amendments, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections to claim 1, 51, and 68 are moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

With respect to claim 1, in the previous Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 19, 20 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over D'Andrea in view of "Beginning Java Objects – From Concepts to Code", Jacquie Barker (2000) ("Barker"). In the Office Action the Examiner conceded that D'Andrea fails to teach or suggest the substance of claim 19 and 20 and turned to Barker to cure D'Andrea's deficiencies. Applicants respectfully submit that

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1749/302725.01
Application No.: 10/646,941
Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.114

D'Andrea in view of Barker fails to teach or suggests all the limitations of amended claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Barker discloses a second Item that does not have a relationship to said first Item, and that in Barker the "lack of a Relationship from said second Item to said first Item logically denotes in said hardware/software interface system that said first Item is private and inaccessible to said second item (page 94, Private visibility section)." (Office Action, dated August 22, 2007, at p. 7).

The portion cited by the Examiner as teaching the limitations in claims 19 and 20 states "private visibility, ... implies that the feature in question may not be accessed via dot notation from client code. For example, if we were to proclaim that the ssn attribute of the student class were private ... then we could not use dot notation in our client code." (Barker at p. 94). In the Java programming language, and others, the dot operator can be used to access a method or variable in another class. In some example instances, a variable, or method can have an access modifier such as public or private. Access modifiers determine which class methods, or variables, can be used by instances of other classes. If, however, a variable, or method, is private to a class, than an instance of a different class can not access the variable or method. This, however, does not imply that a dot operator used in conjunction with access modifiers, teaches or suggests an "owning relationship extending from the first Item to the second Item denotes to said hardware/software interface system that said second Item is publicly accessible to said first Item and a lack of an owning Relationship extending back from said second Item to said first Item denotes to said hardware/software interface system that said first Item is inaccessible to said second Item" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, since each and every element of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by D'Andrea in view of Barker, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

Independent claims 51, and 68 recite similar elements to that of claim 1, and patentably define over D'Andrea in view of Barker for similar reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections to claims 51, and 68.

Insomuch as claims 3-18, 21 – 50, 53-59, 62-67, and 70- 76 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 51, or 68, they too patentably define over D'Andrea in view of Barker. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections to claims 3-18, 21 – 50, 53-59, 62-67, and 70- 76.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1749/302725.01
Application No.: 10/646,941
Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.114

CONCLUSION

Early consideration and allowance of the above-referenced patent application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 22, 2007

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439